

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are pending. By this Amendment, the specification is amended; claim 6 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 were objected to. Claims 1, 4 and 5 have been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Office Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claim 1 has been amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Office Action.

Claim 6 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus rendering moot the rejection. However, as discussed below with respect to claim 1, one of the pair of stabilizer bars, not the rotor, is supported at both sides of the motor and the first gear.

Claim 8 has been amended to obviate the rejection.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over *Schuelke et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,425,585); and claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Schuelke et al.* in view of *Shimizu et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,660,669). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The features of claim 6 that the motor and the reduction mechanism are disposed in the housing and that one of the pair of stabilizer bars is connected to the

first gear passing through a rotor of the motor and is supported at both sides of the motor and the first gear have been incorporated into claim 1.

As disclosed, for example, on page 8, lines 1-12, and on page 9, line 24 through page 10, line 8, as the one stabilizer bar that is connected to the first gear and passes through the rotor is supported by the housing at both sides of the motor and the first gear, a bending moment applied to the one stabilizer bar as an external force can be adequately shared by the one stabilizer bar, the housing and the reduction mechanism. Consequently, it is possible to reduce the bending moment applied to the housing and the reduction mechanism, and thereby improve the reliability and durability of the stabilizer control device.

As acknowledged by the Office Action, *Schuelke et al.* do not disclose or suggest one of a pair of stabilizer bars being connected to a first gear passing through a rotor and supported at both sides of the motor and first gear. It is respectfully submitted that *Shimizu* fails to cure this deficiency of *Schuelke et al.*

It is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation, either in the references themselves, or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references.

Schuelke et al. disclose that an object of their invention is to make possible a purely electromechanical system designed for roll stabilization that will yield a reduction in the required power in the steady-state or quasi-steady-state driving maneuvers while reducing costs in comparison with hydraulic designs. See column 1, lines 44-49.

Shimizu discloses that an object of his invention is to provide an electromagnetic servo unit which, when employed in a power steering system of a

vehicle, can provide under the predetermined condition a steering feeling of a manual type steering system, thereby achieving favorable steering responsiveness. See column 2, lines 13-18. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine these different objectives of *Schuelke et al.* and *Shimizu et al.*

It is also respectfully submitted that the combination of *Schuelke et al.* and *Shimizu* fails to include all the features of claim 1. *Shimizu et al.* discloses an electromagnetic servo unit for a power steering system. The power steering unit includes an electric motor 2, a reduction gearing 3, a first shaft 12 and a second shaft 7. Rotational torque generated by the electric motor 2 is added to the input torque that is input to the first shaft 12, and then the torque is output from the second shaft 7 as an output torque. However, although the left end portion of the second shaft 7 is supported by the housing 1 via the bearing 8, a bearing 14 fitted on the right end portion of the second shaft 7 is supported by the reduction gearing 3. In other words, when a bending moment is applied to the second shaft 7, the bending moment acts directly on the reduction gearing 3 without being shared with the housing 1. Therefore, even assuming it would have been obvious to combine *Schuelke et al.* in view of *Shimizu*, which Applicants do not concede, such a combination would not include all the features of claim 1 and would not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP §2143.

Moreover, *Shimizu* discloses that the first shaft 12 and the second shaft 7 are coaxially arranged with each other and elastically connected through a torsion bar 21 to each other. *Shimizu* does not disclose or suggest opposite faces of shafts 7 and 12 are adjacently connected with a first gear and a second gear respectively, as

recited in claim 1. The combination of *Schuelke et al.* and *Shimizu* thus fails to include this feature of claim 1 as well.

Claims 2-5 and 7-11 recited additional features of the invention and are allowable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections over *Schuelke et al.* and *Schuelke et al.* in view of *Shimizu* are respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are allowable and that the entire application is in condition for allowance.


Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: December 29, 2006

By:


Matthew L. Schneider
Registration No. 33814

John P. Darling
Registration No. 44482

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620